A floor carpet installation system according to claim to wherein said non-woven textile is of synthetic materials.

51.1%

18. A floor carpet installation system according to claim 16 wherein said non-woven textile is needle punched felt.

B1 Cont

A floor carpet installation system according to claim to wherein said non-woven textile is rivited tuft.

26. A floor carpet installation system according to claim 16 wherein a backside of said closing component is connected to the floor by adhesive.

# **REMARKS**

By the present Amendment, claims 1-9 are cancelled and claims 10-20 are added to clarify the claims. This leaves claims 10-20 pending in the application, with claim 10 being independent.

# Substitute Specification

The specification is revised to eliminate grammatical and idiomatic errors in the originally presented specification, and to add an Abstract of the Disclosure and subheadings.

The number and nature of the changes made in the specification would render it difficult to consider the case and to arrange the papers for printing or copying. Thus, the substitute specification will facilitate processing of the application. The substitute specification includes

no "new matter". Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 608.01(q), voluntarily filed, substitute specifications under these circumstances should normally be accepted. A marked-up copy of the original specification is appended hereto.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Original claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By the present Amendment, the claims are rewritten to avoid the alleged indefiniteness in the originally presented claims. Proper antecedent basis is provided for all terminology.

As presently drafted, the claims use the terms "felt", "fleece", and "tuft". These terms are not coextensive, and are recognized terms, as evidenced by the enclosed pertinent portions of the Modern Textile and Apparel Dictionary. Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art, upon reading these terms would be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention as set forth in each pending claim.

Accordingly, the presently pending claims are definite and comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

#### Provisional Double Patenting Rejection

Original claims 1-6 stand provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as claims 4-9 of co-pending Application Serial No. 09/601,280. The claims of this application and of the co-pending application are rewritten to provide a clear line of demarcation. Specifically, the claims of this application are distinguishable from those of the co-pending application by the microadhesive closing element having protruding interlocking

elements with adhesive. In contrast, the co-pending application claims recite interlocking elements on each of the opposite surfaces of the closing element to interlock, and thus releasably engage, and connect a loopless material fixable to the floor surface and a loopless material forming or attached to the back side of the carpet. Embodiments of the present application claims do not fall within the scope of the claims in the co-pending application.

Accordingly, the claims of this application do not recite the "same invention" of the copending application. M.P.E.P. 804 II A, p. 800-20. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the provisional double patenting rejection is requested.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Since the original claims were indicated as reciting allowable subject matter and the presently pending claims correspond to the original claims, the record will not be burdened with a comparison of the claims with the cited patents.

0 - 0 - 0

Accordingly, claims 10-20 are allowable. Prompt and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. 1300 19th Street, N.W.

Suite 600

Washington, DC 20036 (202)659-9076

Dated: Jon. 7, 2003

5